

N60508.AR.000635
NAS WHITING FIELD
5090.3a

LETTER REGARDING THE TRANSMITTAL OF PROJECT MANAGER MEETING MINUTES
FROM 13 NOVEMBER 1992 NAS WHITING FIELD FL
11/29/1992
ABB ENVIRONMENTAL



03.01.00.0017

1000043

November 29, 1992

Commanding Officer
ATTN: Kim Queen, Code 1859
Southern Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
2155 Eagle Drive
Charleston SC 29411-0068

**SUBJECT: Project Manager Meeting Minutes - November 13, 1992
Remedial Investigation - Phase IIA
Naval Air Station Whiting Field, Milton, Florida
Navy CLEAN District I
Contract N62467-89-D-0317**

Dear Kim:

Enclosed are the minutes for the Project Manager Meeting held at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency offices in Atlanta, Georgia. The minutes identify revisions, to the RI Phase II-A program, recommended by FDER, USEPA, and NOAA. I have also enclosed an updated schedule for the RI Phase IIA program. The schedule includes the preparation and submission of the Technical Reports for the geophysical and soil gas surveys.

If you have any comments or questions regarding the minutes or the schedule, please call me at 904-656-1293 (x 314).

Very truly yours,

ABB ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES INC.

Rao V.R. Angara
Task Order Manager

cc: Robert Pope, USEPA
Jorge Caspary, FDER
Jim Holland, NASWF
Eric Blomberg, ABB-ES
John Bleiler, ABB-ES
File: 7560-xx (11.2.2)

ABB Environmental Services, Inc.

**MEETING MINUTES
PROJECT MANAGERS MEETING
NOVEMBER 13, 1992
NAVAL AIR STATION WHITING FIELD**

On November 13, 1992, representatives of Southern Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command (SDIV), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), Florida Department of Environmental Regulation (FDER), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and ABB Environmental Services (ABB-ES) met at USEPA in Atlanta, Georgia to discuss the Navy responses to the Naval Air Station (NAS) Whiting Field Phase I Remedial Investigation (RI) Technical Memoranda comments. The following were in attendance.

Kim Queen	SDIV
Rob Pope	USEPA
Jim Barksdale	USEPA
Caron Falconer	USEPA
Jorge Caspary	FDER
Jim Crane	FDER
Eric Nuzie	FDER
Waynon Johnson	NOAA
Rao Angara	ABB-ES
Eric Blomberg	ABB-ES

The meeting began at 0950 with an introduction of all participants. The meeting agenda included review and discussion of the Navy responses to regulatory (USEPA and FDER) and Natural Resource Trustee comments on the six Technical Memoranda prepared at the completion of the Phase I RI at NAS Whiting Field.

Prior to review of the comments and responses, Mr. Angara handed out a draft schedule of the Phase II RI program at NAS Whiting Field and provided a brief update of the field activities completed since the beginning of the Phase II field program in May 1992.

Mr. Pope announced that NAS Whiting Field will be proposed for placement on the National Priority List (NPL) in the spring of 1993.

During general discussions, Mr. Barksdale asked why the NAS Whiting Field personnel were not present at this meeting. He indicated that it is important to have the base personnel involved in the RI/FS process. Ms. Queen stated that due to lack of travel funds, the NAS Whiting Field personnel were unable to attend this meeting. She informed Mr. Barksdale that the base personnel are being kept informed of all the RI/FS activities being conducted at NAS Whiting Field on a regular basis.

REVIEW OF RESPONSES TO USEPA COMMENTS

At 1015 Mr. Pope began the review of the Navy responses to USEPA comments. Mr. Pope only addressed the responses that remained unclear or the ones USEPA did not agree with. All other responses were found acceptable by USEPA. These minutes will be attached to the Response to Comments and the complete package will be resubmitted to the agencies.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Comment 4: Mr. Pope indicated that a ecological risk assessment workplan should be developed for regulatory review prior to conducting the ecological risk assessment. Mr. Johnson agreed with Mr. Pope and provided an overview of the Natural Resources Trustees role in the RI/FS process. Mr. Johnson also recommended that that the activity appoint an individual on-site as the facility's NRT representative. Ms. Queen indicated that NAS Whiting Field has appointed an individual to that role. The activity will contact Mr. Johnson regarding this issue in the near future.

Comment 6: Mr. Pope stated that USEPA would like a copy of the raw data of all future reports. Mr. Angara indicated that Form I laboratory data sheets (unvalidated data) will be included as an Attachment to all future reports. Mr. Pope also requested that all the data qualifiers be defined.

Mr. Pope and Mr. Barksdale indicated that the USEPA recommends that stainless steel monitoring wells be installed at hazardous waste sites. They also indicated that data from PVC monitoring wells may not be acceptable. Mr. Barksdale further stated that the burden of potentially having to replace the PVC wells with stainless steel wells is on the facility and the Navy.

He indicated that the PVC well may deteriorate and contaminants from the PVC well may be detected in the groundwater samples. Therefore, if a monitoring well is initially free of contamination and a few years later degradation compounds from the PVC are detected, then one can no longer say that the groundwater is free of contamination and the monitoring well will have to be replaced with a stainless steel well. Mr. Angara stated that these wells are being used for the characterization of the nature and extent of groundwater contamination and, therefore, are not projected for long-term monitoring purposes. Mr. Angara referenced the US Army Corps of Engineers' paper covering this issue that was attached to the response to comment handout. Dr. Crane stated that PVC monitoring wells is acceptable by the FDER.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Technical Memorandum No. 3: Soils Assessment

Comment 5: Mr. Pope indicated that it is difficult to determine the extent and size of the waste piles at Site 12 (Tetraethyl Lead Disposal Area). Mr. Blomberg provided a brief history of Site 12 and described the dimensions of the waste piles.

Comment 11: Mr. Pope stated that the subsurface soil and groundwater samples collected at Site 12 did not adequately characterize the contamination at this site and that a "No Further Action" document can not be prepared without additional soil and groundwater data. He stated that USEPA recommends collection of samples from the waste pile/ground surface interface which is approximately 3 to 4 feet below the waste pile surface. He said these samples coupled with the data from Phase I RI (samples collected at the 1 to 2 foot interval) would provide adequate characterization of the waste piles. He suggested that one sample be collected from each waste pile for Target Analyte List (TAL) metals analysis. In addition,

Mr. Pope also requested that a water table monitoring well be installed directly downgradient (south) of Site 12 and a groundwater sample be collected and analyzed for Target Compound List (TCL)/TAL full scan. Mr. Blomberg recommended that soil samples be collected from the monitoring well boring at depths of 0, 5, 10, 15, and 20 feet below land surface (bls) for TAL metals and TCL Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) analysis. All parties agreed that if these explorations were conducted and no contamination was detected, a "No Further Action" decision document could be prepared.

Technical Memorandum No. 5: Groundwater Assessment

Comment 1: Mr. Pope recommended that the drilling mud used during the Phase II monitoring well drilling program be sampled and analyzed for TAL metals to see if the mud is contributing to the contamination of the wells. All parties agreed that one sample of the drilling mud should be collected during the Phase II investigation for TAL metals analysis.

Comment 4: Mr. Pope reiterated that USEPA would like to see all the buildings on the figures identified. Mr. Blomberg indicated that the Navy has NAS Whiting Field as a CAD file; therefore, all future figures will be generated from the CAD files with all the buildings identified by numbers. Mr. Pope also requested that copies of NAS Whiting Field maps showing the industrial area (with building numbers) and the whole installation be sent to USEPA for reference purposes. Dr. Crane requested that a set of figures be submitted to FDER also.

Comment 7: Mr. Pope indicated that there are no upgradient monitoring wells at Site 12 and that upgradient groundwater quality data is necessary for comparison to downgradient groundwater data. Mr. Blomberg said that monitoring well WHF-9-2 which is upgradient of Sites 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 can be used for upgradient groundwater quality data. Mr. Blomberg also indicated that this well will be sampled during the Phase II program for TCL/TAL full scan. All parties agreed to use this well as an upgradient well.

Technical Memorandum No. 6: Phase I Summary and Phase II-A Workplan

Comment 7: Mr. Pope stated that the limited sampling at Site 2 does not support a "No Further Action" document since there is no guarantee that only construction debris and wood were dumped into the former borrow pit. Mr. Pope recommended that one downgradient monitoring well be installed and a groundwater sample be collected for TCL/TAL full scan analysis. In addition, he recommended that a soil boring be drilled to the water table in the center of Site 2 and subsurface soil samples be collected for analysis. Mr. Blomberg suggested that subsurface soil samples be collected from 0, 5, 10, 15, 20, and 50 feet below land surface and at the water table for TCL/TAL full scan analysis. All parties agreed that if these explorations were conducted and no contamination was detected, a "No Further Action" decision document could be prepared.

This concluded Mr. Pope's discussion of the Navy responses to the USEPA comments. The meeting adjourned for lunch at 1135.

The project managers meeting continued after lunch with discussion of the FDER comments.

REVIEW OF RESPONSES TO FDER COMMENTS

Mr. Caspary began the review of the responses to FDER comments. The responses that Mr. Caspary did

not address were acceptable by the FDER or were previously covered and agreed to in the discussion of the Navy response to USEPA comments.

Technical Memorandum No.6: Phase I Summary and Phase II Workplan

Comment 10: Mr. Caspary stated that FDER recommends that all data gaps be filled during the Phase II-A field program. Mr. Angara indicated that the Phase II-A explorations were proposed to identify data gaps existing from Phase I. Ms. Queen added that because no investigations were conducted previously at the newly added IR sites (sites 29 through 33), an additional round of explorations may be needed after Phase II-A to fill data gaps.

Comment 11: Mr. Caspary and Dr. Crane indicated that they had reservations about the placement of the proposed downgradient Phase II-A monitoring well at Site 1. Dr. Crane suggested installing piezometers at Site 1 or install the wells at Sites 2, 17, and 18 to get a better handle on the groundwater flow direction prior to the placement of the well at Site 1. Mr. Blomberg agreed with the suggestion of installing the monitoring wells at Sites 2, 17, and 18 prior to the Site 1 well installation. If the Site 1 groundwater samples and soil samples were free of contamination, then a "No Further Action" would be proposed for Site 1. Dr. Crane indicated that he is uncomfortable with the "one shot" RI approach at landfills such as Site 1. With potential releases in the future, he would like to see at least three monitoring wells installed and sampled and if no contaminants are present, then propose a "No Further Action" with long-term monitoring. All parties agreed that based on the Phase II-A results, long-term monitoring needs to be considered at this site when "No Further Action" is proposed.

Comment 17: Mr. Caspary stated that FDER recommends that the proposed Phase II-A monitoring well (WHF-11-3) be placed halfway between WHF-11-1 and WHF-13-1 due to the lack of groundwater investigations in that area. All parties agreed to move well WHF-11-3 to this location.

Comment 18: Mr. Caspary indicated that the deep groundwater sample collected from WHF-16-CPT-1 (100 feet below land surface) showed Benzene at 400 ug/l and thus wells downgradient to this well should be installed. Mr. Blomberg said that an existing well WHF-16-1 located downgradient of WHF-16-CPT-1 showed no presence of contamination at 42 feet bls. He also said that a monitoring well will be installed at location WHF-16-CPT-1 to first confirm the 400 ug/l of Benzene contamination, and, if it is present, downgradient wells will be installed deeper into the aquifer.

Upon completion of the response review, Mr. Blomberg suggested that the status of Site 5 be addressed. Site 5 was previously investigated under a FDER consent order and the contamination detected at this site was not related to contaminants associated with the Battery Acid Shop waste disposal activities. No work has been conducted since 1985 when Geraghty & Miller investigated Site 5. Dr. Crane felt that groundwater data from 1985 might not be acceptable to propose "No Further Action" for Site 5 and recommended resampling the Site 5 monitoring wells. Mr. Pope said he wasn't sure if data from 1985 would be acceptable but said he would check with some of his associates. All parties agreed to put Site 5 on hold until it can be determined if the 1985 data can be used.

REVIEW OF RESPONSES TO NOAA COMMENTS

At 1412 Mr. Johnson started the review of the responses to NOAA comments. Mr. Johnson did not cover

the responses to comments that he found acceptable.

Comment 2: Mr. Johnson stated that the detection limits for the inorganic analytical methods used for surface water analysis often exceeded the regulatory (i.e. AWQC) standards. He indicated that it is imperative that detection limits are below the regulatory standards for appropriate evaluation of risk to the resources and receptors. Mr. Johnson also indicated that these regulatory standards need to be followed when conducting an ecological risk assessment. Mr. Angara asked Mr. Johnson if he knew of analytical methods available whose detection limits would be below the AWQC and FSWQ standards. Mr. Johnson said there were methods available but wasn't sure of them and suggested we contact Dr. Forrester at the state lab.

He identified the NOAA requirements and stated that data providing information about receptors and effect of contamination on the receptors should be provided in all future reports. He also recommended that a basewide approach to ecological assessment should be taken rather than evaluating individual sites at the facility.

The meeting was adjourned at 1530 hours.

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION	EARLY START	EARLY FINISH	ORIG DUR	1992				1993				1994				1995													
				M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A
PROJECT MANAGEMENT																													
NOTICE TO PROCEED CTO NO. 050	30MAR92		0																										
PROJECT MANAGEMENT	30MAR92	26JUN95	824																										
PHOTOGRAPHICS/GRAPHICS SUPPORT	30MAR92	26JUN95	824																										
CTO NO. 050 COMPLETE		27JUN95	0																										
FIELD PROGRAM - SCREENING																													
FIELD MANAGEMENT	13APR92	3MAY95	777																										
FIELD PREP	13APR92	1MAY92	15																										
GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY	4MAY92	2JUL92	43																										
SOIL GAS SURVEY	15JUN92	14AUG92	44																										
DRAFT TECH RPT PREP - GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY	30OCT92	8JAN93	47																										
DRAFT TECH RPT PREP - SOIL GAS SURVEY	16NOV92	29JAN93	51																										
SUBMIT DRAFT TECH RPT - GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY		11JAN93	0																										
NAVY REVIEW DRAFT TECH REPORT - GEOPHYSICAL	11JAN93	22JAN93	10																										
FINAL DRAFT TECH RPT PREP - GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY	25JAN93	5FEB93	10																										
SUBMIT DRAFT TECH RPT - SOIL GAS SURVEY		1FEB93	0																										
NAVY REVIEW DRAFT TECH REPORT - SOIL GAS SURVEY	1FEB93	12FEB93	10																										
SUBMIT FINAL DRAFT TECH RPT - GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY		8FEB93	0																										
EPA REVIEW - DRAFT FINAL TECH RPT - GEOPHYSICAL	8FEB93	9APR93	45																										
FINAL DRAFT TECH RPT PREP - SOIL GAS SURVEY	15FEB93	26FEB93	10																										
SUBMIT FINAL DRAFT TECH RPT - SOIL GAS SURVEY		1MAR93	0																										
EPA REVIEW - DRAFT FINAL TECH RPT - SOIL GAS	1MAR93	3MAY93	46																										
PREPARE FINAL TECH RPT - GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY	12APR93	23APR93	10																										
SUBMIT FINAL TECH RPT - GEOPHYSICAL SURVEY		26APR93	0																										
PREPARE FINAL TECH RPT - SOIL GAS SURVEY	3MAY93	14MAY93	10																										
SUBMIT FINAL TECH RPT - SOIL GAS SURVEY		17MAY93	0																										
FIELD PROGRAM - CONFIRMATION																													
ELEVATION & LOCATION SURVEY	6JUL92	13MAY94	473																										
SURFACE WATER & SEDIMENT SAMPLING	13JUL92	7AUG92	20																										
TEST PITTING	3AUG92	28AUG92	20																										
SOIL SAMPLING	31AUG92	10DEC92	71																										
PCPT/BAT EXPLORATION PROGRAM	5NOV92	28DEC92	35																										
DRAFT TECHNICAL MEMORANDA PREPARATION - #1	14DEC92	15FEB93	44																										
SOIL BORING & MONITORING WELL INSTALLATION	4JAN93	4FEB94	278																										

Plot Date 30NOV92
 Data Date 30MAR92
 Project Start 30MAR92
 Project Finish 27JUN95

Activity Bar/Early Dates
 Critical Activity
 Progress Bar
 Milestone/Flag Activity

NAVY CLEAN CTO 050
 BASELINE PROJECT SCHEDULE

Sheet 1 of 3

Date	Revision	Checked	Approved

ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION	EARLY START	EARLY FINISH	ORIG DUR	1992				1993				1994				1995													
				M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A
FIELD PROGRAM - CONFIRMATION																													
SUBMIT DRAFT TECHNICAL MEMORANDA - #1		17FEB93	0																										
NAVY REVIEW DRAFT TECH MEMO - #1	17FEB93	26FEB93	8																										
DRAFT FINAL TECH MEMO PREPARATION - #1	1MAR93	12MAR93	10																										
SUBMIT DRAFT FINAL TECH MEMO - #1		15MAR93	0																										
AGENCY REVIEW DRAFT FINAL TECH MEMO - #1	15MAR93	14MAY93	45																										
FINAL TECH MEMO PREPARATION - #1	17MAY93	28MAY93	10																										
SUBMIT FINAL TECH MEMO - #1		1JUN93	0																										
GROUNDWATER SAMPLING	7FEB94	30JUN94	103																										
ECOLOGICAL & PUBLIC HEALTH SURVEYS	7FEB94	14MAR94	26																										
DRAFT TECHNICAL MEMORANDA PREPARATION - #2	7MAR94	7JUN94	66																										
WATER LEVEL MEASUREMENT	2MAY94	13MAY94	10																										
DRAFT TECHNICAL MEMORANDA PREPARATION - #4	9MAY94	10AUG94	66																										
DRAFT TECHNICAL MEMORANDA PREPARATION - #3	6JUN94	7SEP94	66																										
SUBMIT DRAFT TECHNICAL MEMORANDA - #2		7JUN94	0																										
NAVY REVIEW DRAFT TECH MEMO - #2	8JUN94	8JUL94	22																										
DRAFT FINAL TECH MEMO PREPARATION - #2	11JUL94	22JUL94	10																										
SUBMIT DRAFT FINAL TECH MEMO - #2		22JUL94	0																										
AGENCY REVIEW DRAFT FINAL TECH MEMO - #2	25JUL94	23SEP94	44																										
DRAFT TECHNICAL MEMORANDA PREPARATION - #5	8AUG94	8NOV94	66																										
SUBMIT DRAFT TECHNICAL MEMORANDA - #4		10AUG94	0																										
NAVY REVIEW DRAFT TECH MEMO - #4	11AUG94	12SEP94	22																										
SUBMIT DRAFT TECHNICAL MEMORANDA - #3		7SEP94	0																										
NAVY REVIEW DRAFT TECH MEMO - #3	8SEP94	7OCT94	22																										
DRAFT FINAL TECH MEMO PREPARATION - #4	13SEP94	26SEP94	10																										
FINAL TECH MEMO PREPARATION - #2	26SEP94	7OCT94	10																										
SUBMIT DRAFT FINAL TECH MEMO - #4		26SEP94	0																										
AGENCY REVIEW DRAFT FINAL TECH MEMO - #4	27SEP94	29NOV94	44																										
SUBMIT FINAL TECH MEMO - #2		7OCT94	0																										
DRAFT FINAL TECH MEMO PREPARATION - #3	10OCT94	21OCT94	10																										
DRAFT TECHNICAL MEMORANDA PREPARATION - #6	10OCT94	13JAN95	66																										
SUBMIT DRAFT FINAL TECH MEMO - #3		21OCT94	0																										
AGENCY REVIEW DRAFT FINAL TECH MEMO - #3	24OCT94	27DEC94	44																										
SUBMIT DRAFT TECHNICAL MEMORANDA - #5		8NOV94	0																										

Plot Date 30NOV92
 Data Date 30MAR92
 Project Start 31MAR92
 Project Finish 27JUN95

Activity Bar/Early Dates
 Critical Activity
 Progress Bar
 Milestone/Flag Activity

ROOT A050

NAVY CLEAN
 CTO 050
 BASELINE PROJECT SCHEDULE

Sheet 2 of 3

Date	Revision	Checked	Approved

